



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0740FL-1 for District School Board of Collier County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCPS has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas and articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.</p> <p>The first goal is to adopt standards and assessments to prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace to compete in the global economy. CCPS has in place the common core state standards as with a RTT state program in place. CCPS has a vision to address developing a college and career pathway plan to help align educational curriculum and instruction, support students with counselors and developing student electronic portfolios, STEM courses, and outreach to raise workforce awareness. In addition, CCPS will provide curriculum programs such as AVID, sheltered instruction for English learners, dual enrollment, and Rtl to better ensure students are on track in meeting the new Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>The second core reform area, building data systems, is addressed in the vision to build on a web warehouse that has been extensively used and developed in the District for over 10 years. In data systems, it will extend assessments and report systems, align teacher evaluations and compensation system, continue to develop item banking and test creation, and integrate electronic portfolios for students.</p> <p>The third core reform area is to recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective educators. The vision crosses over four initiatives for leadership in professional development of teachers, evaluations systems for all educators, and ongoing professional development. It will also develop a program of mentors to address full certification of teaches and new principals and leaders.</p> <p>The fourth core reform area, to turn around lowest achieving schools, is addressed in the CCPS vision of reform through continuing to refine methods through full-scale research on models to turn-around the lowest performing schools in the county.</p> <p>The vision for reform did not clearly call forth increased equity. This is reflected in the statements that it will increase learning for all students without explaining how personalized learning environments have been designed to provide better access to sub-groups and address particular learning needs in the county. There was not articulated vision in particular on high risk students. It is also important to discuss in the vision why 12 schools and 11,707 students are not low poverty schools so that 26% of the students will receive the same resources as the poorest and the most vulnerable. The vision is set for all students when equity in educational reform requires some priority to increasingly serve the neediest first. Otherwise, it will be an equal not equity system. Also, the applicant did not address recruiting specialty area teachers where they are needed most, such as special education, math and science teachers. This section was scored high for addressing all of the core areas of reform, but at the lower range for not providing a clearer vision about how the program is intended to decrease the equity gap in student achievement and college career readiness and access to teachers in hard to fill content areas.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CCPS approach will support high quality implementation of reform including selection of all schools in the county because the overall total of low income students is 60%. CCPS provided a list of the schools that will participate and identified the total number of students in each school, the number and percent of high needs students and low income students, and the number of participating educators. Full points were allotted.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

CCPS includes a three year plan for FY 12, 13 and 14 without a clear organization of the goals as they relate to the activities, deliverables and outcomes. There was no discussion and no high quality plan to address how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools. CCPS did address how its plan will help to reach its outcome goals and how its plan will improve student learning for all students.

This section was scored at the low level for not addressing the plan for scaling beyond the participating schools, and at the high range for address learning outcomes for students and describing how it will reach those outcomes in the four reform areas.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The CCPS vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals for all students except in the achievement gap and in the area of reading at the 3rd grade level. Here the achievement gap is barely reduced. For example, the achievement gap is 28 points in 2011-12 for the Hispanic group compared to the white group; the difference between the groups is projected to be only two points lower by the end of the program. The data is based on percent scoring proficient. This applies only in 3rd grade reading and here the gap statistics are similarly low across the board. The difference is only two points for American Indian children and four points for Black students after five years of the program. Other content area test scores, on the other hand, showed a high level to diminish the equity gap ranging from decreases in the gap from 6 to 26 points.

Also, it was not clear that the measures presented in section A4 were designed to equal or to exceed State ESEA targets for each participating school. This section was scored low for not stating that it would meet or exceed and for the mentioned equity issues; but at the higher end for addressing ambitious and achievable annual goals otherwise.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS described some success in the past year in advancing student learning and achievement. It did not address its progress in increased equity in learning and teaching, except it is notable that the Lifting all Boats article comparing NAEP scores. This article showed a history of growth between 2009 and 2012 in 3rd grade reading and math. CCPS did not include other charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrate its ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps, including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates over the past four year.

CCPS achieved some ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools but it only documented its progress between 2009 and 2010.

CCPS will make its student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. This can be seen in its description of its comprehensive web-based Data Warehouse that is integrated with several large systems with Student Information System, where teachers can download student data by classroom and across years to capture change in student achievement and inform instruction. The system is used at district and school levels and with parents and students. Parents have been surveyed on effective use of the programs that helps to monitor their student's academic progress. The parent portal and also student engagement in chats and conferences using the web-site to set academic goals were described.

This section was scored low for not showing high level of achievement over the last four years but at the high range for the access of the data for educators, parents, and students.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS described how it provides a high level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments through publications by the State Department of each school's school-level expenditures by fund type for regular K-12 instruction. The CCPS website

also provides a link with projected costs by function and object on a school-basis. Salary schedules are provided for district positions. There is a link to the salaries for instructional and support personnel, for actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

This section was scored at a high level at the lower range for not addressing the Census Bureau classification.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS demonstrated some evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in its proposal by virtue of the fact that the State is already a RTT state and therefore teacher certification, turn around models and common core standards and assessments are already in place and authorized under the state regulations.

This section was scored at the middle level for recognizing it is in a state that has a RTT program, but at the lower end for not clearly addressing how it enjoys autonomy at the district level and not clearly addressing how it enjoys autonomy at the state level.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS described evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and support for the proposal. The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, several colleges, parent advisory committees are a few of the examples of external stakeholder letters. There were descriptions of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal involving formal meetings, round table session, and community events. CCPS provided dates and documented sources of meeting evidence. In addition, it is notable that the College and Career Pathways Plan was developed by community input.

CCPS did not describe if it was collective bargaining or not. Outside of the four forms showing principal support, it was impossible to determine how much teacher support existed for the proposed program.

CCPS provided letters of support from such key stakeholders community organizations, the business community, and faith based organization as well as institutions of higher education.

This section was scored at the low level for not documenting the level of teacher support across the county but at the high range for demonstrating strong inputs from key stakeholders and feedback from the community in the design of the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS provided evidence of the process it undertook to analyze its current status in implementing personalized learning environments. It utilized the staff from the prior RTTT grant to identify strategies that were successful and areas that still require work. There were three meetings to get feedback to help prioritize activities. This process did not present a high quality plan for its analysis. CCPS did not take into consideration analysis outside of the prior grant and existing knowledge of gaps and holes that remain.

CCPS did provide a very clear and carefully developed presentation of the logic behind the reform proposal. It clearly identified important needs and gaps currently existing in the county schools.

This section was scored at the middle level for presenting a clear logic about the program components, but at the lower level for not providing a clear presentation of in-depth analysis of the gaps and needs.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS described an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner. The programs that were described in this section involved parents and educators in developing personalized learning environments. For example, CCPS will focus on providing student opportunities to demonstrate goals, achievement, and interests through learning portfolios across grades and curricula. It will engage parents through student led conferences using portfolios. This personalization of learning and goal setting through portfolios are described to deepen learning. *It was not clear* that the students would understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals except perhaps through the use of AVID for students at risk and the use of RTI with underachievers in reading.

CCPS did not provide a high quality plan for C1. For example, for the AVID program, the plan stated that there will be professional development in year one but it was not clear for how many educators, how long the professional development took place. The plan lacked specificity and detail.

CCPS identified and will pursue learning and development goals that are linked to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. This is related to its plan to incorporate expanded course offerings, career academies, and the College and Career Pathways. The Pathways will provide goals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

CCPS understands how to structure student learning to achieve goals, and measure progress toward those goals. In part, this is addressed through the use of lesson study procedures providing evidence of learning and formative assessments related to the Common Core State Standards. Item banks will be developed to assist CCPS in implementing the Standards preK-12.

CCPS students and educators will be involved in deep learning in various areas of academic interests developed through programs to bring career and planning for college to students and their parents.

CCPS addressed, *to a very limited extent*, how it will increase access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. This was based on turn-around schools having better access to cultural relevant content.

CCPS addressed how it would help students master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving.

With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill. CCPS will enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time with college- and career-ready skills.

CCPS plans to provide a variety of instructional approaches for learning that are integrated with technology including iPads in several pilot sites, a common web to share test items across subjects, digital dialogues with educators and students, and hands-on labs in STEM areas. CCPS will provide digital learning content aligned with college- and career-ready standards and with college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

CCPS will provide ongoing and regular feedback, including frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards.

CCPS *did not clearly address how* it would provide personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills in college- and career-ready standards. CCPS content, instructional approaches and supports *will provide some accommodations* for high-need students who are English Learners or RTI for remediation purposes. In this way CCPS addressed how its students will be on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards.

CCPS *did not provide a clear plan* on how it will provide mechanisms for on-going training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

This section was scored at the middle level for not addressing all the components and for not including a clear high quality plan. It was allotted points at the upper middle for describing a majority of the components.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All participating educators engage in training and in professional teams or communities. The training supports the capacity of CCPS to: provide individual and collective professional development through Leadership Teams; to recruit teacher leaders through career ladders; and to use a comprehensive educator evaluation system.

CCPS did not provide a high quality plan for C2. The specificity was lost and the details for a clear progression were not provided. For example, the plan stated, "Design and deliver professional learning opportunities to teacher on topics including, problem solving, data collection and analysis and selection/deliver the districts' cadre of research based interventions." This

was repeated across all five years showing no detail and no thoughtful progression or steps.

It was not clear how CCPS will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs. It was not clear how CCPS will adapt content and instruction, provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives) because it did not clearly describe this criterion in the proposal or the plan.

It was clear that CCPS will frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. This is shown through the use of data to guide all aspects of planning, instruction, and use of resources.

CCPS will improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the a cadre of coaches and a peer coaching teams. There is a system described for teacher and principal evaluation systems that will include frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness.

It was not clear how CCPS will provide recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement of the system.

CCPS described how all participating educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The resources included—

- Actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;
- High-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments), including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and the tools to create and share new resources; and
- Processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

It was not clear how all participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirement. It was not clearly addressed in the narrative nor in the plan.

CCPS will provide training, policies, tools, data, and resources with information. It will use sources such as the district's teacher evaluation system. The system helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess and take steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness for the purpose of continuous school improvement.

CCPS will provide training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps

CCPS did not present a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

CCPS was rated at a middle level for addressing some of the components but at the lower range for not addressing many of the components in this section.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
CCPS described its practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by organizing the schools providing an oversight team. CCPS described a plan to hire central office and school personnel including dedicated grant personnel in managing, budgets, and evaluation. CCPS describes how it will provide support services to its participating schools without a clear master plan for a large number of schools across the county.		
CCPS described how it will provide school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and		

responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.

CCPS described that it will provide students with opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. However this did not apply to all areas. For example, specific courses must such as Algebra, biology and geometry must be completed the by credits. CCPS will provide opportunities for a number of courses on-line consistently across the curriculum.

CCPS described how it will provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways through the development of the College and Career Pathways Plan which provides goals based on individualized learning path, utilizing electronic portfolios and identified with college and career ready standards.

CCPS described how it would providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. CCPS will use a Universal Design for Learning and also develop teachers to shelter instruction for English learners through SIOP. SIOP does not address, however, the need for primary language support to access core curriculum for newcomers or students in the elementary grades who are beginning levels of English and need primary language support. CCPS did not address bilingual support and did not address New comer programs.

This section was allotted a high level of points for addressing most all criteria in this section, but at the low range for not addressing primary language support for early stages in English language development and not providing a plan to develop courses without seat hour requirements.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
--	----	----

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS described how its school infrastructure will support personalized learning by providing all participating students, no matter their economic status, the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal.

CCPS will ensure that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support through a range of strategies. For educators the support is professional development. For the parents and the students there will be opportunities through the Title I Schools and the EL Departments. There was a variety of formats available across all the schools, for example, there was online support and web resources provided in different languages for local support.

CCPS will use information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.

CCPS will ensuring that schools use interoperable data systems for systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data.

This section was allotted full points.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
CCPS provided consultants and a Collaborative Planning Team to assist in the process. It provided a context for formative assessments and distributing the summative reports on the website. The plan did not provide a strategy to implement continuous improvements after the term of the grant. The process to engage stakeholders in timely feedback, adjusting implementation to problem-solve or trouble shoot was addressed by posting quarterly reports on a website and two formative assessments one in year one and one in year two. There was no evidence of a rigorous process. It did not provide further detail to oversee evaluation with a detailed management plan across the project and specifics on the type of qualitative and quantitative measures it would use across each of the 15 projects. This section was allotted middle points for not identifying instruments, the calendar for feedback, and rigorous engagement nor engagement of key stakeholders after the life of the grant. It was allotted upper range for including important elements to begin to address this criterion.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: CCPS provided strategies for ongoing communication with educators through monthly meetings, reporting protocols, and across 15 committees within the program. CCPS provided for engagement with external stakeholders through web information, Town Hall Meetings, and communication and reports in three languages. Full points were allotted this section.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: CCPS provided ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for some of the required performance measures. CCPS did not provide performance measures for the PreK-3, or 4-8 populations. CCPS provided applicant proposed performance measures for the 9-12 population. The measures selected were reading and math scores and did not include other measures that more closely monitor readiness for 9- 12 graders. CCPS did not provide a clear rationale for the selection of reading and math scores to measure college and career readiness. CCPS did not address how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. CCPS did not describe how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. This section was scored at the middle level for providing all the required performance measures but at the lower range for not providing the criteria to develop the applicant proposed performance measures.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: CCPS did not address how it plans to evaluate the effectiveness of its proposed program and its funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures. There was discussion of hiring a outside evaluator, of providing oversight for 15 programs, and disseminating the evaluation report. However, there was little information to substantiate how the evaluation would address this section and was allotted a low score at the high range.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: CCPS identified all funds that will support the project and the external foundation support, the school, State, and other Federal funds. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and it clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including-- Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments. Full points were allotted this section.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant because there were few timelines, deliverables and goals prioritizing the sustainability activities. The plan did not include support from State and local government leaders to provide financial support. The plan did describe how the investment in developing human resources would be available to the school after the term of the grant. This section was allotted low points at the high level.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposed to integrate a partnership with the Education Foundation of Collier County designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to 7 middle/high schools from the participating schools. The purpose of the partnership is to address academic improvements rather the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students as required in this section. Specifically, the goal of the partnership is to increase college readiness based on test scores; and also, to a lesser degree, the partnership is intended to improve mentorship and externship opportunities. CCPS did describe that the partnership will provide highest priority to participating schools with high-need students by selecting Title I Schools for the first year.</p> <p>CCPS described how it would track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children by student level for the participating students</p> <p>CCPS described how it would use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis for students affected by poverty.</p> <p>CCPS described how it would develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities over time by extending the program into other schools.</p> <p>CCPS described how it would improve results over time through feedback loops involving input from families and students.</p> <p>CCPS described how the partnership would integrate education and other services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs such as life skills, leadership, and workplace skills for participating students.</p> <p>CCPS described how the partnership would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the needs and assets of participating students that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the partnership; • Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the applicant; • CCPS described how it would create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results. • CCPS described how it would engage parents and families of participating students in decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs. • CCPS clearly describe how it would routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems; and <p>CCPS identified annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students. This section was allotted high points at the high level.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCPS coherently and comprehensively addressed how it will first build on core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching. The first assurance area is confirmed; CPS has in place the common core state standards and is in a state that has a RTT program in place. CCPS addressed developing a college and career pathway plan to help align educational curriculum and instruction, support students with counselors and developing student electronic portfolios, STEM courses, and outreach to raise workforce awareness.</p> <p>Second, CCPS builds on its data systems with a web warehouse that clearly extends assessments. It will report on student</p>		

progress through performance based measures using advanced digital systems, align teacher evaluations and compensation systems, develop item banking and test creation, and integrate electronic portfolios for students.

Third, CCPS will recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective educators through an initiative for leadership in professional development of teachers, evaluations systems for all educators, and ongoing professional development. It will also develop a program of mentors to address full certification of teaches and new principals and leaders.

Fourth, CCPS will turn around the lowest performing schools and continue to refine methods through full-scale research on models to turn-around the lowest performing schools in the county. CCPS met all the assurance area required for absolute priority one.

Total	210	116
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0740FL-2 for District School Board of Collier County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: A(1) The application provides a vision for the project that is clearly tied to its efforts in the four core educational assurance areas, including enhancements to its Data Warehouse of student-level data, instituting performance evaluation systems for teachers and principals capable of relating practice to student growth, and making use of technology to improve teachers' instructional practice and students' focus on college and career readiness. The project proposes to implement 15 parts and the application fails to set forth a coherent vision for this array. It also appears that the connection of some of these parts to the goals specifically to student learning are unclear, if not obscure. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: A(2) The discussion of the selection of schools was succinct given that all schools in the district will be participating in some part of the project, depending on the nature of the particular intervention (e.g., Summer Program is offered for students who need to catch up based on state assessment scores, College and Career Pathways Plan is originally intended for secondary students). The overall district enrollment meets the competition's eligibility criterion. The application included all of the required information on the schools and their students and staff. This criterion was rated in the high range.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: A(3)		

The application does not include a high quality plan for scaling up the reform effort embodied in the application inasmuch as the entire district will participate in the project. The RTT-D plan strategies will be implemented in all schools and for all students in order to provide the biggest impact and those strategies will have been implemented by the end of the grant. The application details a comprehensive logic model of reform centered around the belief that the improvement of teaching will result in the improvement of student learning outcomes. Therefore the project places emphases on professional development, implementation of a large number of instructional programs, and a new approach to the evaluation of teacher performance.

This criterion was rated in the high range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A(4)

The goals set for improved learning and performance of students are not ambitious (i.e., 2%/year) at any grade level as measured by FCAT performance in reading and math. Given that all subgroups are projected to have the same level of annual gains, the closing of gaps is inadequate. The change in graduation rate (from 82% overall to 86% overall in four years) reflects a lack of confidence in the proposed interventions. In addressing the topic of student outcomes, the application makes reference to state targets and standards but there is insufficient explanation of the relationship of these benchmarks to the project's goals.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

B(1)

The presentation of data related to the LEA's past performance in advancing student learning and increasing equity in learning and teaching is very limited and insufficient. Multi-year data is provided for only two schools that underwent reforms that included the replacement of staff, not a strategy being proposed in this application; all schools in the district will participate. Graduation rate data were only presented for one year. The application does present sound evidence of the LEA's provision of student performance data to students, educators, and parents in ways seen as effective in monitoring student progress.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

B(2)

Clear and relevant evidence was provided that the LEA makes public data on salaries, by school, for teachers and instructional staff via the Comprehensive Budget Book that is available on the LEA website. Whether this publication also provides data on the resources supporting pupil support and school administration was unclear.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

B(3)

The application does not appear to directly address the issue of sufficient autonomy to implement the proposed personalized learning environments. The application does mention that its planned College and Career Pathway Plan exceeds parameters

in a state mandate but making an inference from that statement regarding autonomy is an insufficient rationale.

This criterion was rated in the low range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

B(4)

The application documents stakeholder engagement representing a broad range of interests (e.g., community, Chamber of Commerce, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, local teacher association) in the development of the LEA's strategic plan; this application is consistent with that plan. This application included staff input by central office and building administrators as part of an annual planning process. There were two public sessions about this application organized by the Education Foundation, a partner to the LEA and the Teacher Union was provided a draft in October. How any feedback affected the application's content is unclear. Also unclear is support from the Teacher Union. The application does include letters of support representing a reasonable cross-section of relevant stakeholders (e.g., government, business, higher education).

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

B(5)

The application provides clear evidence that stakeholders were surveyed regarding needs around the topic of increasing students' academic proficiency. The application documents the LEA's analysis of less than desirable academic performance and aligned proposed strategies with these findings. The project was designed to address those needs and gaps in service. An analysis of the LEA's current status in implementing personalized learning environments is lacking; the application does not appear to have a high quality plan related to current status analysis as required in this competition.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
C(1)		
<p>The application presents an extensive compilation of programs that will be instituted within the grant to personalize the learning environment. There are programs for all students (e.g., Electronic Student Portfolio) to help students track the accomplishment of their college and career ready goals. There are programs (e.g., AVID, Timez Attack, advanced certification) for students depending on individual needs for remediation and support or advancement. The College and Career Pathways Plan will enable students to set goals and take advantage of opportunities for early exposure (through mentorships, for example) to a variety of careers. There is, however, a lack of sufficient attention to grades K-7 in terms of appropriate instructional offerings. The application describes how teachers will be provided opportunities through Lesson Study to implement high quality instructional approaches and align their instruction to standards. The application's treatment of parent engagement is inadequate to the detriment of achieving maximum impact on students. Support to parents lacks an ongoing focus. In general, the elements for a high quality plan are included in the Appendix but lack specific rationale for the activities. The plan has a very large number of interventions but lacks both an appropriate organizational design and rationale for the interventions, or a view of these programs focused on the quality of individualization of an educational plan for each student.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the middle range.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C(2)

The application emphasizes the critical role of teachers in students' academic achievement and the application describes a convincing effort to provide teachers with diverse professional development opportunities to support implementation of personalized learning environments. These include mentors for new teachers, projects for Lesson Study within professional learning communities, and training programs related (e.g., writing across the curriculum, content standards, integrating those standards into curriculum, using the new data systems coming on stream related to personalized learning). The results of Lesson Study will support educators' capacity to adapt content and instruction for students more effectively. The application provides reference to digital resources available to teachers without providing detail. The use of a new teacher and leader evaluation system, PD-360, demonstrates the LEA's commitment to examining classroom practice and ensuring that professional development resulting from that evaluation is appropriate and based on evidence. The application provides a convincing case that the number of effective teachers will increase once this evaluation system, use of mentors, and targeted professional development is implemented. The application includes the elements for a high quality plan.

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: D(1) The application describes structures to provide oversight to schools, to provide annual reviews of school's progress against benchmarks, and to provide appropriate follow-up support. The LEA uses an oversight team composed of LEA, local government and community members. The application provides evidence that the LEA has moved (at the elementary level to date) to providing student progress reports on the basis of mastery of learning objectives. The application provides a convincing description of the ways in which, through the Education Foundation, students are provided opportunities to demonstrate mastery in multiple comparable ways including industry certification programs and other career and vocational opportunities. There is also a description of a number of programs to be implemented with this grant (e.g., SIOP and Universal Design for Learning) that are somewhat related to improving accessibility. The description of school autonomy reflects a practice of schools having to seek LEA approval and not having autonomy over the factors described in the selection criterion. Most of the information required under the definition of a high-quality plan (e.g., goals, activities, responsible parties, and credibiity) is included in this section's narrative discussion as it describes organzing the central office, flexibility and autonomy for schools, opportunities for students to progress and demonstrate mastery in untraditional ways, and accessibility to all students. This criterion was rated in the high range.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: D(2) The application provides an extensive and feasible description of planned efforts to provide access to students, parents, and staff content, tools, and learning resources. For example, there is 24 hour access for students and parent to student records, portfolio assignments, and career choice profiles. Parents may also access supplementary book lists and special resources. An online social learning platform, Edmodo, will provide additional tools to students. Evidence is presented regarding use of the information technology systems. The LEA's current Data Warehouse presents an integrated interoperable data system containing: standards and curriculum,instructional practices, assessment (lifecycle from item creation to scoring), district staff information, comprehensive student information, document storage, capacity for data integration and analysis/reporting. The only concerns involve the inadequate attention given to familiarizing parents with these resources and the apparent absence of technical support related to these information systems. Most of the information required under the definition of a high-quality plan (e.g., goals, activities, responsible parties, and credibiity) is included in this section's narrative discussion		

This criterion was rated in the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(1)</p> <p>The application does not provide an appropriate design for a rigorous continuous improvement process. The application does not include a set of intermediate measure of progress for the 15 projects to be implemented, raising concerns about how their trajectory can be monitored and measured. The application's attention to the need to publicly share information on the quality of its investments is lacking.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the low range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(2)</p> <p>The application documents the use of regular communication channels to internal stakeholders (e.g., central office staff, program managers, school administrators, faculty) regarding the project, and these appear to be more than sufficient. The application describes a fairly extensive approach to communicating with the external stakeholders through its website and mass media (e.g., television, radio) including providing information in multiple languages. Communication with internal and external stakeholders also includes regular meetings (school level staff meetings, meetings of the Curriculum and Instruction Staff in the LEA, annual Community Town Hall meetings) resulting in feedback to assist with continuous improvement efforts.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the high range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(3)</p> <p>The application presents tables related to the choice of performance measures and annual targets (with one exception). The performance measure associated with placement in classrooms taught by highly effective teachers fails to include annual targets beyond the current (2012-2013) school year. The nature of the selected student performance measures is justified; one measure reflects increasing students whose schools offer a particular intervention, one measure reflects increasing the number of families completing the FAFSA form needed to secure college financial aid. The other measures relate to student academic performance, measured by the state assessment or a measure using benchmark tests of staying on track to graduation. The performance measure goals are not particularly ambitious. The application does not discuss how the results on the performance measures (largely annual in nature) will inform the conduct of the project, nor whether the measures themselves will be reviewed for their appropriateness.</p> <p>This criterion was rated in the middle range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E(4)</p> <p>The application indicates that an external evaluator will be hired to conduct both a formative and summative evaluation of the project and provides evidence of that intention in the budget. Formative evaluation of implementation will be available to the LEA quarterly; this is sufficient to enable the LEA to monitor the project. Summative evaluation will examine year end results</p>		

of projects for students and teachers against the performance measures. The description of the evaluation activity encompasses the full scope of the project, all of its 15 discrete activities including improved use of technology as well as all of the external programs being brought into the LEA related to classroom instruction, career exploration, and professional development.

This criterion was rated in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: F(1) The application provides complete budget information for the entire project, by year, as well as for the 15 individual projects. The budgets for the projects appear to be reasonable; the only concern in some cases is the reduction in personnel beyond year 2 because of potential reductions in services. The budget does not include any funding from other sources, even though the Education Foundation is a partner in this application. The budget identifies funds to be used for one-time investments. This criterion was rated in the high range.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: F(2) The application fails to provide a high quality plan for sustainability after the term of the grant. Description of replacement funding is absent. Although some of the project funds are used for one-time purchases, most of the funds are used for re-curing expenses involving personnel or annual fees for the use of programs so not having a plan for funding beyond the grant is incompatible with sustainability. This criterion was rated in the low range.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Competitive preference priority The use of other public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the school's resources to provide additional family and student supports is extremely limited. The application provides evidence of only one partner, without providing information on the level of financial commitment. In the case of that partner, the Education Foundation (a community organization), the focus is on career exploration (including supporting the development of certain workplace and life skills) and planning so that the degree to which the partner intentionally addresses social, emotional, or behavioral needs of participating students is ambiguous. What the partner offers in terms of real world learning opportunities provides a strong contribution to focusing students' attention on being college and career ready. The application includes appropriately related, achievable indicators to track results that can be used to make adjustments in services. The application does not appear to take into consideration the needs of students facing significant challenges in the design of the Education Foundation's services. Since the services also appear to be of an educational nature, the integration of educational and other services described in the criterion is not appropriately addressed. This criterion was rated in the middle range.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Absolute Priority

The application demonstrates, through its organization of project activities, that this project will build on the core educational assurance areas. Its extensive investment in data systems will ensure that students, families, and teachers are fully informed of student progress measured against learning standards, with ambitious and achievable goals for 24 hour access. The data systems will also include extensive information to inform college and career planning for students and families. The application describes programs for students to meet specific needs whether students require remedial services or the opportunities to accelerate and deepen their learning. The application rightly emphasizes the importance of teacher professional development to ensure that students are taught by highly effective teachers. Teachers are provided human and technology-based resources to undertake improvements in practice, along with a new performance evaluation system having a goal of identifying and addressing any weaknesses in the planning and delivery of instruction.

Total	210	110
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0740FL-3 for District School Board of Collier County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Collier County Public Schools (CCPS) is an RTTT Phase 2 district for the state of Florida, having been involved in RTTT reform for the last two years. This grant and the current state RTTT grant are based on the district's Strategic Plan objective which is to "Ensure all students are immersed in data-driven, evidence-based curricular programs that provide diverse learning experiences and multiple opportunities to master the Florida educational standards." The district's vision too speaks to the first RTTT educational assurance area; specifically the Collier Schools mission is that "All students will complete school prepared for ongoing learning as well as community and global responsibilities." Further evidence of the district's focus is that the grant application adopts the *CCPS College and Career Pathways Plan* 2011-2012 (though in need of updating for present and future years) as its guiding framework. CCPS has, therefore, established a vision of reform that addresses all four core educational assurance areas as follows. In developing the CCPS RTTT-D plan, the school district sought to integrate all other school improvement plans of the district: the Superintendent's Strategic Plan, the Three-Year Academic Plan, and the current state Race-to-the-Top grant plan.

1. Standards and Assessment for Students to be College and Career Ready

The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) adopted the Common Core State Standards in July 2010 and the district states that CCPS began preparing district staff for implementation of the Standards the ensuing school year. The state has also added additional content called the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, which Collier has also embraced, including additions to the Common Core in all core subjects as well as Physical Education, World Languages, Fine Arts, and Health Education. The CCPS application also notes that "Florida passed legislation requiring all school districts to implement a career and college plan to prepare students for post-secondary success;" the CCPS grant application is an outgrowth of this requirement in that it seeks funding to implement its version of college- and career-readiness for all students in this school system. The applicant states that its Plan will have "cutting-edge curriculum that addresses the needs of students entering the job market . . . technical schools, community colleges, and universities." Career-related experiences and job-preparatory instruction are central to the CCPS Plan.

2. Data Systems to Measure Student Growth

It is significant that in commenting on the present CCPS RTTT application, the FLDOE made special note of Collier County's already "strong system for providing data to students and teachers." The state appeared impressed that the application looked to "improved access to educational data." In fact, the district wants to use RTTT funding to update its current web-based Data Warehouse to be aligned with the Common Core and Florida college- and career-standards so that students will have access to learning resources and teachers will have access to more standards-based instructional content than exists now, and use of the platform will increase. Seamless integration of student, instructional, and assessment data such as proposed electronic student portfolios, and teacher evaluation results, will allow for real-time, accessible use of formative and summative information.

3. Recruitment, Development, and Retaining of Effective Teachers and Principals

CCPS states that it has been able through the Phase 2 RTTT grant to intensify professional development so that it is now job-embedded and addresses the standards, curriculum implementation and greater teacher use of technology. For the present application, CCPS proposes, based on needs identified through the Phase 2 grant to add leadership development, mentoring and value-added professional development to the repertoire of offerings. New teacher and principal evaluation systems will also utilize the district's digital platform to link student achievement data and educator performance.

4. Turning Around Low-Achieving Schools

All of the 48 schools of the district --- elementary, middle and high school --- are low-achieving schools and will be participating schools of this grant application. Previous to this application, the district has used its state's Transformation Model to remove staff from the low-performing schools while also attempting to change the culture of the schools through enactment of more learning time for students, more flexibility for principals in budgeting, staffing, and calendar issues, and a stronger curriculum.

The district's discussion of its adherence to the four educational assurance areas was a general overview of the intent of the district to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning. The district's position is that implementation of the Common Core State Standards, Florida's requirement that each school district have a College and Career Plan, and the school district's focus of supporting teachers and adding to its existing Data Warehouse will be the foundation for a creditable and clear approach to establishing a personalized learning environment for its students and teachers.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All of the 48 schools of the district --- elementary, middle and high school --- are low-achieving schools and will be

participating schools of this grant application. The schools have been identified as schools needing improvement based on the state's model of using student achievement data on the state assessment (FCAT or Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test), graduation rates, participation and performance of students in accelerated coursework, and postsecondary readiness of students. Five of the district's elementary schools are also priority and focus schools by the state definition and these lowest-performing schools are also Title I schools. The applicant states that it has decided to include all of its schools and all grade spans K – 12 in this reform effort to ensure that the most students and teachers benefit from the initiatives and strategies of the plan, although some initiatives will be implemented as pilots before scaling up across the district. Therefore, there will be 3,170 educators and 43,725 students. The completed *Applicant's Approach to Implementation* table shows that 59% of students are low-income so that the participating schools together meet the competition's eligibility requirement. No rationale for targeting all the grade spans of the schools was given.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The RTTT-D grant requires that applicant's plans enumerate key goals and the activities for achieving the district's reform goals, a reasonable implementation timeline, designated and appropriate deliverables and staff responsibilities for a credible reform plan overall. The applicant has six (6) so-called achievement goals for its plan [emphasis is by the applicant] with measurable outcomes. A chart of the implementation strategies, rationale and participants with links to the goals is provided. (Note that the first goal is not included in the chart probably by typographical omission since the remaining five goals are in the chart.) The goals address personalized learning environments for all students, college- and career-readiness, data and technology use, supporting teachers and school leaders to acquire the knowledge and skills to improve student achievement, turning around the lowest achieving schools, and increasing community outreach and partnerships. The chart has no timelines or persons responsible or deliverables cited. But, the plan does have some more specific, though not always easily measurable, objectives tied to improved teaching and learning in every classroom such as "differentiat[ing] instruction through rich learning experiences informed by results from formative and summative assessments." Other objectives can more easily be assessed such as increasing the number of students who graduate from high school in four years.

The underlying theory of change for the district is the belief that "investing in human capital will improve student achievement." The district also has a Logic Model grounded in the five achievement goals and alignment of the district's various improvement plans from the already mentioned Superintendent's Strategic Plan to the College and Career Pathways Plan of this application. A graphic organizer of the Logic Model summarizing the goals and means of implementing the goals is contained in the plan.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant included several pages of data tables documenting and in support of its vision for student achievement, graduation rate improvement, college enrollment, and postsecondary attainment. With reference to student achievement on the FCAT the Collier County PS has set target goals that meet Florida's annual targets; the applicant's data tables indicate that their targets will exceed the state's targets by 2013 – 2014, but not for all subgroups. Reading improvement targets for all grades for the grant period are set at 2% growth, with the exception of only 1% growth in the last year. Math proficiency targets are the same at 2% for all four years, achievable targets, but not ambitious ones considering present scores that are well-below the statistical mean..

The applicant asserts that these goals will reduce the overall achievement gap by 2% or higher each year, but examination of the district's own data tables in the application reveals that gaps between the overall achievement scores and subgroups as well as existing gaps between subgroups remain throughout the grant period. For example, the baseline grade 3 proficiency score in reading overall was from 14 – 26% for most subgroups in 2011 - 2012 and will still be comparable by 2015 – 2016. So that some improvements mcan be seen, the district states tthat it will use the Value-Added Model to show increases in growth in student achievemem as compared to absolute growtht. Using the differences in scale scores between the baseline year of 2011 – 2012 and this school year of 201 – 2013, the district projected scale score jumps from only 7 points for English Language Learner students to as high as 192 points for students overall. Projections of improvement in student achievement are also provided for Algebra and Science end-of-course tests given by the state.

The district has established more ambitious targets of increasing graduation rates of 3 – 5% per year and increasing college going rates of 2 – 4% per year. College credit earning rates are also projected to improve from 2 – 3% per year. No explanation of the criteria for these targets was provided.

Thus, the district's plan is modest in its projections for change; student achievement targets are not ambitious in meeting or exceeding state targets for most subgroups and therefore will not significantly impact achievement gaps between groups.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This district has finished two years of a state department of education Phase 2 RTTT grant. The district purports that grant has been successful and that the new RTTT-D grant will build on lessons learned and achievements. For example, CCPS states that through the Phase 2 RTTT, it has been able to intensify professional development so that it is now job-embedded and addresses the standards, curriculum implementation and greater teacher use of technology, but no comparative evidence was provided of pre-grant professional development programs and training implemented during the grant.

The district also claims that it is meeting the three goals of the Phase 2 RTTT; namely increasing the graduation rate of high school students, closing the achievement gap and increasing the percentage of students scoring proficient on the NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress). But, because only baseline data for 2011 – 2012 is presented (applicants did not have to include student achievement data for 2010 – 2011), improved graduation rates cannot be determined. Neither baseline nor the most current NAEP scores were included in this application; instead, an overview of Florida state student progress on the NAEP was found in the appendix, but it did not include data specific to the CCPS. And, last year there was only a 1% increase in college enrollment; a statistically insignificant difference.

On the other hand, the district does present more compelling statistics of recognized school improvement. The FLDOE gives letter grades to schools using a combination of indicators from student achievement to postsecondary achievement of students to acknowledge school improvement and the pace of same. The applicant reports that "From FY11 to FY12, the number of elementary and middle schools receiving an 'A' grade increased from 38% to 59% of district schools (compared to an FY12 state average of 48%)." This represents a meaningful increase from 15 to 23 schools (school system high schools are not included in the Florida grading program). The district acknowledges however that three of its schools had lower grades in FY12 than they did the previous year, explanations of expectations by the state that some school grades would drop under its revised school grading system notwithstanding. Evidence of the state status of Collier County Public Schools was provided in the appendix. Two other schools previously in Tier I, the 5% of PLAS, were removed in 2010: the high school had a 2% increase in reading for students overall and 3 – 4% increases for Hispanic and ELL subgroups. Writing proficiency was also reported to have improved. The district also stated that the percent of AYP goals met also increased from 68% to 74%, although there was no evidence presented as to that effect. The elementary school removed from the Tier I category had a 2% increase overall in reading and in subgroup scores as well; writing proficiency improved by 7%. Both schools were reconstituted under the Florida Continuous Improvement Model.

Nevertheless, with five schools being identified as priority or focus schools for 2012 - 2013, the district has had to place additional resources in them and it is too early to see whether these actions will have positive effects. Using the Transformation Model, the actions have included replacing the principal, adding new assistant principals, increasing learning time, placing reading, writing and math coaches in the schools and providing support through District Resource Teams to name a few. The district will be evaluating the impact of these changes throughout the school year.

The applicant states that student performance data is available to students, parents, teachers, and administrators through its Data Warehouse. The data is most useful to educators because year-over-year analysis of student progress is possible since it contains longitudinal summative academic data student by student and by demographic subgroups. Lacking evidence of teacher use of the Data Warehouse features and data to inform and change instruction to meet student needs, this statement

is not supported.

The district cites "Student-data chats" held with pupils and parent access to student records as other ways in which data is made available to stakeholders. The district makes particular note of its eSembler GradeBook for parents to stay abreast of student academic activities. "In 2011, 82% of secondary parents surveyed reported that the GradeBook was effective for monitoring their child's progress in school."

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCPS states that its school system's website is used to post district policies and procedures, as well as district budgets and amendments and financial reports as part of its efforts to increase transparency. Florida requires each state to complete a Program Cost Report of actual expenditures by school and program and this is on the website too. Salary schedules and compensations are also shared with the public through the website. Thus, while a wealth of information is available through this portal, no mention is made of other avenues for letting stakeholders know about LEA processes, practices and investments.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

0

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant appears to have misunderstood the essence of this part of the application. Rather than supplying information regarding conditions under State legal, statutory, and regulatory the district and schools must comply as it implements personalized education (what is allowed and what is circumscribed by law and practice), the applicant's response was to share data regarding the state's progress, particularly relative to other states, in improving education for Florida's students and the positive relations the school district and state have enjoyed. The applicant did not respond to issues of autonomy or flexibility that its schools and the school system would have in making fiscal, instructional, or operational decisions.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that teachers, principals, students, families, and community representatives were engaged in development of this RTTT-D plan. First, Phase 2 RTTT personnel were involved so that improvements from that grant could be identified, built upon and included in the present proposal. Second, teacher union representatives received a draft of the proposal and their feedback was invited for any needed changes in the plan. The union president signed the application. A meeting was also held with the principals of the district. Their suggestions for the plan are documented in completed feedback forms from the meeting, samples of which are included in the appendix. Community Input Pathways Meetings were also held to communicate the components of the plan and get community feedback. The public announcement of these meetings was included in the appendix. The district's education foundation was a partner in facilitating the Pathways Meetings.

Most importantly, given the fact that the district's plan is focused on college- and career-readiness, the district states that community businesses and the Southwest Florida Workforce Development Board participated in two meetings where the goals and indicators of the plan were shared and feedback sought. A summary of the findings of these meetings is included as evidence. The district states that input from these meetings and from the Future Force Development Committee was used to make modifications to the plan. Which suggestions were included in the final RTTT-D plan of the district is unclear.

Letters of support accompanied this application, including letters from institutions of higher learning, community organizations, and the mayor of the City of Naples particularly supporting the *College and Career Pathways Plan* component of the district's RTTT-D submission, with which all parties seemed very familiar. The state department of education reviewed and commented on the applicant's plan; however whether or not the district altered the plan in response to the comments was not self-evident.

In summary, the applicant's appears to have sought input from a variety of school system partners, including educators, parents, businesses, local and state government, and community organizations. Documents support the district's statements that suggestions were provided.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>As with Section A3, this sub-criterion relates to whether the LEA provided evidence of goals, timelines, activities, and deliverables for analyzing the status of personalized learning in the participating schools and in the district. Integral to such a high quality plan is an analysis of the needs and gaps that the plan will address. Using the constructs of the four educational assurance areas, the district's analysis of its current status and needs and gaps resulted in plans for implementing new strategies to address problems undermining improvements in student achievement, student college- and career-readiness preparedness and establishment of personalized learning in all CCPS classrooms and courses.</p> <p>For example, with reference to the RTTT goal of having districts establish personalized learning environments, the district states that it has already initiated individual learning plans for students (no evidence of this is provided). Under the auspices of this RTTT-D grant, it is planning to create electronic student portfolios. A student's portfolio will include samples of exemplary work, test scores, career plans and activities that the student, his/her parents, and teachers can use to make educational decisions. Within the district's high quality plan for preparing students for college and careers, there are detailed year-to-year activities and deliverables for implementation of the electronic portfolio by 2016. Persons responsible for the activities and deliverables were also identified.</p> <p>Another example looks to the assurance area of college- and career-readiness and existing gaps in CCPS efforts addressing this component. The district found that changes in the employment landscape of Collier County were not being reflected in the content of career education programs in the district's middle and high schools. Evidence of the district's evaluation of present career education offerings includes a tally of existing programs by school contained in the <i>College and Career Pathways Plan</i>. As for the electronic student portfolio, there are detailed year-to-year activities and deliverables for implementation of the career assessments aligned with national standards by 2016. Persons responsible for the activities and deliverables were also identified.</p> <p>Also planned are updating of curriculum, the certification of program teachers, and "community engagement and education about career pathways . . . to support the enrollment of students in programs and academies." Other needs and gaps such as helping teachers to become more highly effective will be supported through a new teacher evaluation system, the Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM) based on Marzano's research on classroom instruction that works. The district also plans to implement the state of Florida's Disfferentiated Accountability Model (DA) to provide District Resource Team and Community Assessment Team support to its F grade schools.</p>		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has a high quality comprehensive plan of action with activities, deliverables, year-to-year timelines through to 2017, and persons responsible identified for the four major initiatives and special program components for preparing students for college and careers. The four initiatives are labeled: (1) Personalized Learning Environments; (2) College and Career Readiness; (3) Data and Technology; and (4) Turnaround of Lowest-Achieving Schools. Each initiative has several separate projects, making for a very large, many-layered proposal. Not all projects focused on personalized learning. For example, Project 13 which includes Charter Schools in LEA planning is not as well-outlined as other projects in discussing the role of personalized learning in these additional schools and the relationship of reform of the other Projects to this one. Rationales, some based on research, others on recent efforts by the district to bring alternative reform models into play in the school system, are also provided. The full plan is documented in the appendix of the CCPS proposal in support of the requirements of this section of the RTTT-D application template. The Personalized Learning Environment initiative as outlined below is an example of how CCPS is approaching comprehensive implementation of each initiative.</p> <p><u>Personalized Learning Environments</u></p>		

The district has five programs that it plans to implement to achieve this RTTT-D objective: (1) the electronic student portfolio previously discussed; (2) the use of lesson study; (3) alignment of national and state academic and college/career-readiness standards and assessments; (4) enhanced and advanced coursework; and (5) the use of specialized differentiated instruction programs.

"The district has set a projected outcome of having 80% of students K – 12 having electronic portfolios by 2016 leading to improved academic achievement and college and career pathways . . . as measured by the count on the district Data Warehouse and by test scores." The portfolios will be used to accelerate and deepen student learning since they can be used to record individual student learning goals and the student's activities to achieve those goals and can be accessed by students, teachers and parents. Thus, the portfolios support teacher instructional decision-making and engagement of parental support.

The district is proposing implementation of two AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) programs to also accelerate and deepen student learning: the Advanced International Certificate of Education program --- AICE ---and the Pre-AICE. AICE is a college preparation program whereby students can earn up to 45 hours of college credit while still in high school. Pre-AICE prepares middle school students for the high school level program. Dual enrollment courses with local colleges and universities will also be structured, as well as, virtual school offerings and Saturday Academies for Advanced Placement.

Lesson Study is a well-researched approach to improving teaching practice, helping teachers design standards-based lessons and helping them to understand each student's learning needs and how to address them. The district reports that all schools have participated in one lesson study cycle per year for the last three years but does not provide evidence of increased student achievement as a result or teachers' greater use of effective, proven instructional methods. The question can be posed why plan for wider use of the approach if it has not proved effective in CCPS. It is indicated that CCPS teachers need appropriate professional development for success in Lesson Study and so the district will use Professional Development 360 (PD-360), an online program to support teachers implementing the Common Core.

Differentiated instruction options for teachers and students include Positive Behavior Supports (PBS), Response to Intervention (RtI), SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) especially for scaffolded ELL instruction, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL). All of these are research-based programs that have been used successfully in other school districts with special education, ELL students and other high-needs populations to increase student achievement and engagement in school and student responsibility for learning. Again, although PBS has already been in 100% of CCPS schools since 2010 no CCPS school/district results of significant improvements in student learning are presented to justify this as a program that will foster mastery of academic content by this school system's students.

Similarly and with regard to the district's plan for turning around its lowest-achieving schools, there are plans to implement extended day programming at one school to test the efficacy of this approach. It is interesting that a district with five (5) priority/focus schools would only implement this in one school if there is a belief that this is a worthy strategy,

All of the remaining three major initiatives have several well-thought out approaches for possible implementation. The complexity the programs of each initiative and the number of programs to start up, monitor and evaluate will be challenges that the district will face. As the above overview of the district's plan to implement personalized learning environments suggests, this and the other three initiatives have approaches primarily focused at the secondary level. Plans for the K – 7 level are more sketchily presented.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a comprehensive plan of activities, deliverables, and timelines to support the goals of the design; specifically for students to master the Core Content State Standards and be prepared for college and 21st century career challenges. The CTEM is an online teacher observation instrument that combines the *iObservation* tool of the Marzano model with professional development needs assessments to provide feedback that administrators use to provide feedback to teachers on instructional practice. The district's current state RTTT grant was used to develop and implement CTEM. Having been in operation for a year now, the district states that it has already seen an impact from this new evaluation system, but the

measures referred to are soft measures of a developing district-wide common language about teaching and teachers' sense [emphasis added] that there instructional expertise is improving, although no quantitative data is provided in support of these observations. But, the district recognizes that there are issues of linking value-added dimensions to CTEM have not been resolved, and the attempt to link professional development outcomes to teacher practice and student growth has proved costly and problematic. The district plans to continue to use and refine the CTEM so that instructional practice and student growth and human resource and professional development components can be well-integrated. These variables will also be added to the CLEM to make it a more effective tool for evaluating principals after this first year and refinement of initial use. In a complementary way, the district also plans to continue professional development for more effective use of *iObservation*. There will also need to integration of the district's new differentiated pay system for teachers and administrators in the turnaround schools.

All of the remaining three major initiatives have several and similarly well-thought out approaches for possible implementation. Other components of the district's RTTT-D plan already discussed provide teachers with tools for evaluating the effectiveness of provided supports. The district's Data Warehouse and digital platform, though in need of updating, uses the HERO program to "manage all the professional learning activities from the registration process, through evaluations and follow-up activities. There is also a web-based course management and collaboration program, ANGEL, that has a Learning Object Repository (LOR) that allows "storage, tagging, searching, and management of learning objects" across courses, sections, departments and schools. The district attests that teachers have access to a wide variety of of standards-aligned instructional content and learning resources within the Edmodo platform. No example of such content was provided. The district also states that teachers also participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to plan instruction based on the Common Core, review student data and analyze assessment results, conduct Lesson Study. No evidence such as PLC agendas was presented or impact data on classroom practice.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has developed a comprehensive plan of activities, deliverables, and timelines to support the goals of the design; specifically for students to master the Core Content State Standards and be prepared for college and 21st century career challenges. For instance, the district has developed a Project Leaders Organizational Structure for the 15 major projects of this RTTT-D plan. The 2011 – 2012 Organizational Chart is also included, however links between the Project Leaders and other district administrators in the school system was not clearly evident. The Organizational Chart did show that the office of the Executive Director of Planning & Accountability/Staff Development included the positions of Director of Assessment & Data Management to whom the Data Warehouse Manager, Coordinator Program Evaluation, and Data & Testing Technician reports. The Coordinator of School Improvement reports to the Director of Differentiated Accountability & School Improvement.</p> <p>The district's state RTTT-D Oversight Team will also have responsibility for supervision and guidance of the new RTTT-D plan. The Oversight Team of school district personnel, community and local government members meets quarterly to monitor the RTTT implementation. The district states that experience with the state grant has confirmed the need for a Grant Manager to implement this RTTT-D. There are also plans to add two additional positions, that of Budget Specialist and External Evaluator Services. All three positions are included in the plan budget. Job descriptions for the first two are included in the appendix. Aside from the Oversight Team, this grant will have an Internal Management Team led by the Superintendent, with her Cabinet, the Grants Manager, RTTT Project Leads, a Collaborative Planning Leadership Team (CPLT), and others being part of that designated team. The Collaborative Planning Team consists of an implementation sub-committee for each of the 15 main projects. "Each committee will report regularly to the CPLT regarding progress towards RTT-D benchmarks and goals." Since these are new organizational entities, no evidence yet exists as to the effectiveness of these structures to monitor and successfully support implementation of segments and the full plan.</p> <p>Each school has a School Advisory Council (SAC), the school leadership team of the schools of the district. The SACs, in an advisory capacity, together with the principal have flexibility and autonomy over schedules, budgets, staffing, and other school-</p>		

level operations, yet there are no plans for training new SAC members or re-training present members to prepare them for their new roles in this reform.

The district reports that it has negotiated a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the teachers' association to adjust the teacher workday and calendar to meet federal and state requirements. The MOA is part of the plan documentation.

As previously noted, students will have many new options like virtual school and the AICE and Pre-AICE programs, and existing options like dual credit and Advanced Placement courses. New graduation requirements call for students to earn 24 credits and pass Algebra I and Biology. The district's weaker statement of support of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (DOK) is not sustained by examples of teacher-guided instruction focused on advancement. The district cites its *College and Career Pathways Plan* and activities as evidence of providing equity and opportunities for students to advance through personalized and accelerated learning as already addressed in earlier sections of this review. The district's implementation of sheltered instruction (SIOP) has been in place since 2005 and combined with Reading Horizons technology, yet ELL FCAT scores do not bear out the effectiveness of these programs in improving student learning enough to close achievement gaps. The district will soon be piloting the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework to provide flexibility in teaching special education students and raising their scores.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The emphasis here is on the applicant developing a comprehensive plan of activities, deliverables, and timelines to support students, parents, and educators having access to learning tools and student data of the project and the technical support and training needed to enter online resources it. The district reiterates that its Data Warehouse, Gradebook, ANGEL, and other applications are be accessed 24-hours and from stakeholders' homes. Again, the district states that the 10-year old Data Warehouse "is used extensively in the classroom, as well as at the school and district levels for a myriad of applications that facilitate real-time, as well as long term, analysis of student learning and educational progress specific to instructional objectives and standards."

But, no statistics from these many years of use are provided to validate the district's statement or to show how such broad use has resulted in improved teaching and learning.

Via ANGEL, parents can access content for their child's courses, assignments and learning resources. The district's website also gives parents access to book lists, graduation requirements, and resources for core and non-core subjects. The district states that it has purchased a new resource *Parents K12* that can be used by parents, students, and teachers. *Parents K12* is a platform of grade-level academic activities in the core subjects and contains information on preparing students for the FCAT and getting ready for grade-level reading. Previously, the district's plans for developing Wireless Community *Connections* through RTTT-D funding were highlighted. An annual STEM conference involves parents and the community in exploring workshops on science, engineering and math technology.

An innovative new use of the district's Edmodo platform is proposed; specifically establishment of an online social network for students to use as part of the district's focus on personalized learning environments. Highlighting some of what students will be able to as listed in the plan:

- Create customized multi-media projects;
- Express and explore personal viewpoints in moderated debates, poetry walls, or threaded; communications;
- Explore academic topics outside their school's curriculum.

Teachers in five schools will pilot use of iPads and the *Teach Me in My World* elementary curriculum. and vocabulary program. Evidence of how well these two resources will work was not made available in the district's RTTT-D plan.

In its comments to the district, the state made particular note of the proposal's discussion of Resources at Home, Technology in Schools, and Technology to Guide Instruction sections recapitulated here as "demonstrating a clear focus on using data and technology to inform instruction and to provide access to student achievement information to students, parents, and educators."

Use of these technologies will be supported by existing Building Technology Coordinators, Instructional Technology Specialists and System Support Technicians of the district. There is no evidence of satisfaction or sufficiency of the services provided.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In keeping with the requirement that the LEA have a high quality plan for timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals, CCPS proposes a plan that uses an outside, independent consultant to conduct an evaluation of the entire program each year of the grant and internal analysis to gather feedback from stakeholders for any needed and timely modifications. The consultant's resume was included in support of using outside expertise. The consultant will conduct both formative and summative evaluations and provide reports of the evaluations twice in Years 1 and 2 of the RTTT-D implementation, and summative assessments in Years 2 – 4 as well. While the plan for formative evaluations in Year 1 is a strength, formative evaluations in at least Year 2 may also be appropriate given the introduction of some components in the second year and the fact that some issues, as with the teacher and leader evaluation systems may not first surface or be resolved until later.

Plans are for the district to also have the Collaborative Planning Team (CPT), previously mentioned when addressing the infrastructure of the LEA in support of the RTTT-D grant, meet with and assist the consultant in design of the evaluation process and monitoring of overall progress of RTTT-D goals. While the CPT can provide the consultant with valuable insight, plans for CPT involvement in design of the evaluation process should be carefully approached to maintain objectivity in how evaluations are conducted and the results of same.

The results of all evaluations, internal and external analyses, of the district's RTTT-D implementation will be shared with various stakeholder groups and using various modes of communication. Executive summaries of the summative evaluation reports will be posted on the district website and the complete reports themselves will be shared monthly with the Superintendent and cabinet, school principals, and Curriculum and Instruction staff for feedback and assistance in implementing modifications or adjustments coming out of the assessments. Executive summaries will likewise be shared through Town Meetings and local television and radio programs so that community stakeholders can be apprised of RTTT-D progress.

The applicant was thorough in providing a series of nearly 20 questions and monitoring/evaluative activities to be addressed through the continuous improvement process. However, plans for ongoing corrections after the grant term were not discussed.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's intentions to increase stakeholder engagement through community outreach and partnerships is a strength of this applicant's RTTT-D plan and is one of six (6) primary achievement goals. The district hopes to engage and inform families and community members in the reform and provide services that will increase academic achievement. Various avenues for communicating with parents and the community are offered, including face-to-face town meetings, electronic and social media communications, the use of local media and, almost always, in the language of the targeted communities. As to specific actions, the Superintendent will share updates on progress on RTTT-D projects with all stakeholders in public forums.

A creative solution to lack of internet connectivity in the homes of some parts of the Collier County school district is development of *Wireless Community Connections*. Some of the funding sought through RTTT-D would be used to research how to establish this project.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Six types of performance metrics are planned by CCPS for this RTTT-D project from student measures of academic growth and value-added to status measures of achievement against college- and career-readiness standards to measures of the percentage of teachers and principals evaluated as being effective or highly effective based on the results of the district's new CTEM and CLEM. Tables with baseline scores and performance targets for students by subject area and grade and by subgroup, during the grant period and beyond, were provided in the plan. Unfortunately samples of the instruments that will be used were not provided and the rationale for using the indicated tools was limited; no narrative accompanied over 73 pages of the RTTT-D *Performance Measures* template, with 65 of them being *Performance Measure* baselines and projections for the number and percent of highly effective teachers and principals by school and subgroup. In many cases, the number of participating students with highly effective teachers was quite low, making obvious the challenge the district has to recruit, hire and train enough teachers to meet benchmarks. For example, in one of the elementary schools, only 5 of 144 participating students had a highly effective teacher/principal.

Certainly some of the measures and the kinds of data they provide and for which ages and grades are familiar ones like state achievement assessments. Others such as the processes and tools of the teacher and leader evaluation systems are not as well known as to the efficacy of them for the purposes indicated.

The applicant included several pages of data tables documenting and in support of its vision for student achievement, graduation rate improvement, college enrollment, and postsecondary attainment. With reference to student achievement on the FCAT the Collier County PS has set target goals that meet Florida's annual targets; the applicant's data tables indicate that their targets will exceed the state's targets by 2013 – 2014, but not for all subgroups. Reading improvement targets for all grades for the grant period are set at 2% growth, with the exception of only 1% growth in the last year. Math proficiency targets are the same at 2% for all four years.

All of the primary performance measures cited here are annual measures and therefore will not provide time-friendly data to inform instruction. With the exception of the teacher/leader evaluation tools, these instruments cannot be reviewed and improved over time since the district is relying on state assessment data for most of its performance assessment purposes. The number of middle school students participating in the AVID programs will serve as a measure of implementation of this program component. The number and percent of students completing the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) will measure college enrollment, but there are limitations with the FAFSA that all students who complete the form do not go on to postsecondary studies, at least not always within the 16 month timeframe, after graduating high school. In summary, the performance measures for the CCPS proposal are varied in purpose, format, rigor, and frequency of when the assessments will be given.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There was no direct response to this section of the RTT-D template, however the district's coherent plans for evaluation of continuous progress described elsewhere seek to evaluate the effectiveness of investments as demonstrated by the district's intent to address the following overarching questions and variations of those questions presented in the RTTT-D plan:

- Were the RTTT-D goals achieved? If not, is the district on track to achieving them? How?
- Were the RTTT-D funds spent according to application timelines and proposed initiatives?
- Was there fidelity in RTTT-D budget expenditures?

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables, should identify RTTT-D funds as well as district monies, grants, state and other Federal funds that will be used so that determinations can be made as to the reasonableness and sufficiency of requested monies and the rationale for same. The applicant is applying for \$40 million being eligible for this maximum amount as a district with 25,000+ participating students. Neither in the narrative nor the budget pages were any local, state, other federal or grant funds separately identified that will be used to fund this proposal. A summary Budget Table of overall costs for personnel, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, and training stipends is followed by Budget Tables for the same costs for each of the fifteen (15) individual projects of this proposal. One-time or not full 4-year investments were clearly identified in the budget tables. Budgeted costs for Project 3 will serve as an example of how planned expenditures match the purpose and activities of the project.</p> <p><u>Project 3 – Increase Advanced Coursework</u></p> <p>Personnel costs include coordinator and group leaders' salaries and fringe benefits for the Pre-AICE and AICE programs for 4 years, teachers' salaries and fringe benefits for 2 years, and teachers' salaries and fringe benefits for the Saturday Academy for 4 years. Supplies for these programs are also budgeted, however without an explanation, the rationale for budgeting only two years of supplies for the Pre-AICE and AICE programs as compared to 4 years for all other advanced coursework programs is unclear. Over \$103,200 per year in Years 1 and 2 is budgeted for Pre-AICE and AICE middle and high school contractual services without details as to the services provided.</p> <p>The few reductions in projected costs from year to year are to serve as a foundation for sustainability of program components. For example, professional development expenditures are projected to decrease as staff members receive training to serve as in-district trainers for such costly programs as AVID and SIOP. The district also believes that "industry certifications will bring in revenue to the district after the second year of implementation of the grant as the [district] continues to expand the number of industry certification academies." But no evidence of this having occurred within CCPS or in other school districts with industry academies is provided. Thus, the suggestions here for sustainability of RTTT-D program components are limited.</p> <p>The district will be partnering with The Education Foundation, a non-profit and independent Collier County community organization. Many career opportunity, internship, and externship programs for students and teachers will be developed by the partnership. The district indicates that the two organizations "will share funds and exchange data system information," but the amount of funds and for what specific purpose is not indicated in the budget portion of the proposal.</p> <p>The district states that it "utilized a system of analysis of each project in order to assign a specific amount of money to accomplish measurable goals based on project needs, activities, deliverables and timelines. In most cases, individual budget categories cost itemizations for each of the 15 projects seems reasonable and sufficient. More extensive explanations of other budget items would have been appropriate. For example, the nature/content of the pre-AICE and AICE contractual services as indicated above.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Some reductions in projected costs already highlighted are also a foundation for sustainability of program components. But, as previously indicated the LEA has not developed a detailed plan for continuing the project after the grant period and no budget is presented for post-grant implementation of the plan.</p> <p>Given the ongoing requirement of a superintendent's evaluation of most every school district in the nation and the requirement and procedures for same in CCPS, inclusion of superintendent evaluation costs in this RTTT-D budget is inexplicable, especially in consideration of sustainability of this activity without RTTT-D funds. The use of RTTT-D funds and the sustainability of them for charter schools was also not understood since there was no narrative explanation of why</p>		

expenditures for charter schools would be included for this grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This district is opting for the Competitive Preference Priority that calls for districts to integrate public and private resources in partnerships designed to augment school system resources for providing additional social, emotional, and behavioral supports to RTTT-D grant participating students and their families, who will also be served through the primary grant.

CCPS will address this priority through collaboration with an existing community partner; specifically The Education Foundation (ED) with which it has had a strong partnership for over twenty (20) years. The applicant presents a coherent for a sustainable partnership that "forwards the mission and strategic planning of both organizations while leveraging the combined resources and expertise to provide experiences for students, educators, and families." The district states that there is congruency between the goals of the ED *Real World University* and the CPS *College and Career Pathways Plan*. The common agenda of the two entities is in keeping with the career opportunity and awareness program designed. The proposed program for four middle schools and three high schools in the district and their students has five (5) objectives of internships, job shadowing, and mentoring for students with small business owners; externships for teachers and counselors with community and business leaders; a curriculum and personalized learning map of educational pathways and real world experiences for students and their families; parent education for support of student college and career decision-making; and strengthening of both organizations websites for improved communication of career opportunities and resources. The schools are Title I schools with large numbers of high-needs students. A Memorandum of Understanding included with this application has already been struck between the two parties in support of this partnership and joint program effort. A detailed plan of year-to-year activities and deliverables from SY 2013 to SY 2017 is also included.

Population-level results include student achievement scores, the number and percent of students participating in program components, and the results of a unique control-group comparison of the effect of mentorships on students in six of the schools and one school without mentorships. The academic impact of the program will be measured by the achievement of five objectives, including but not limited to the objective of having 75% of participating students pass the FCAT in grade 8 or grade 10 beginning in Year 2 (2014). There are also five family and community impact objectives to be measured through still-to-be-developed surveys. Among the objectives to be assessed is increasing the number of businesses engaged and supporting the CCPS-ED program. Thus, altogether there are ten (10) population-level desired outcomes. The district completed the table of *Population-Level Desired Results* providing great detail about population groups that will receive planned services and desired targets for objectives such as increased graduation rates for each subgroup.

Career counselors to be hired for the participating schools will use student data to help students craft individual personalized learning paths. Aside from population-level data, annual evaluations will be conducted to assess progress of the project. The district states that there will be quarterly reviews of data and implementation results for program adjustments over time.

By the end of the second year, assuming positive evaluation outcomes, the district states that it will scale up program strategies by extending mentoring services to all students across the district K-12 in a 3-year phase-in beginning with high school students and ending with elementary students. The partnership program allows for the integration of education and business/career opportunity services.

In summary, the applicant has developed a rich and detailed plan in partnership with a key community educational partner that is ambitious and achievable with performance measures and targeted resources to high-needs students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CPS plan establishes a vision of significant and creative reform that uses many innovative approaches --- a digital platform for program evaluation and technology support of several program components; a curriculum and instructional framework for personalized learning for every student to meet national and state academic standards and be college- and career-ready; and new performance-based teacher and principal evaluation to name just a few --- to meet Absolute Priority 1. The vision of individualized education paths and most of the 15 projects of this applicant's plan support a reform model for turning around PLAs meets the acceleration goals of Absolute Priority 1 as well. The fifteen projects of this application also meet identified needs of the schools by the LEA, correlated with the four core educational assurance areas as discussed at the beginning of this review, but the multiplicity of projects may make it difficult for this proposal to be scaled up to other LEAs.. While significant decreases in achievement gaps were not substantiated as described in the proposal, the goal of value-added student growth is also in keeping with this required Priority.</p> <p>This application was well-organized in many sections, less well in one or two others, but for the most part effectively used the template for RTTT-D proposals and had clear cross-references from one component of the proposed plan to other components as well as the appendices so that understanding whether the innovations of this proposal met the requirements of Absolute Priority 1 was easy to determine.</p>		
Total	210	132